Memorandum

Flex your power! Be energy efficient!

To: All District Deputy Directors

For Environmental Planning

All District Environmental Office/Branch Chiefs

Date: July 2, 2007

File: NEPA Delegation

From:

JAY NORVELL

Chief

Division of Environmental Analysis

Subject: Review Procedures for Environmental Impact Statements and Environmental

Assessments under the NEPA Delegation Pilot Program

Background

Caltrans has updated its environmental document review procedures in response to its assumption of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) responsibilities under the Surface Transportation Project Delivery Pilot Program pursuant to Section 6005 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). The formal assignment of NEPA responsibilities took effect on July 1, 2007 with the execution of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Caltrans. Caltrans' application specified that Caltrans would revise its environmental document review procedures to ensure that all documents are appropriately reviewed for compliance with NEPA and other applicable federal laws. This policy memorandum describes those revised procedures.

Summary

Attachment 1 to this policy memorandum describes the 5-step review process required for all Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) and Complex Environmental Assessments (EA) prepared by under the Pilot Program. Complex EAs are defined as those EAs that include multiple location alternatives, debate related to purpose and need, strong public controversy, issues related to logical termini or independent utility, individual Section 4(f) determinations, complex Endangered Species Act issues, numerous cumulative impacts or high mitigation costs. The District Environmental Deputy or designee, with concurrence from the Headquarters Division of Environmental Analysis (DEA) Environmental Coordinator (HQ EC), will determine which documents will be processed as complex EAs due to their complex technical issues or controversial nature. For Local Assistance projects, the District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE) and a senior environmental planner will determine Complex EAs with the concurrence of the HQ EC.

All District Deputy Director
For Environmental Planning
All District Environmental Office/Branch Chiefs
July 2, 2007
Page 2

The District/Region will complete an environmental document Quality Control review for each environmental document, as required in the Quality Control policy memorandum, dated July 2, 2007. The District/Region will also complete the Environmental Document Review Checklist (Attachment 2).

All EISs and Complex EAs will be reviewed by a DEA interdisciplinary team led by the HQ EC prior to District/Region approval. All EISs will be reviewed by the appropriate Legal Office, which will complete a legal review for the Draft EIS and determine legal sufficiency for the Final EIS before the EIS may be signed. The Legal Office will review EAs, as time is available, at the request of the District/Region. Routine EAs may be signed in the District/Region at the completion of the District QC Review.

For each step of the five-step process, the purpose is described, as are protocols for documentation submittals, prescribed review times, and signature authorities.

Applicability

Effective immediately for all State Highway System and Local Assistance projects under the Pilot Program, this memorandum supersedes the following Division of Environmental Analysis memoranda for environmental document review procedures:

Date	Subject
March 28, 2003	Revised EIS Review Procedures
November 29, 2001	Revised EIS Review Procedures

If you have any questions regarding this policy memorandum, please call Cindy Adams, NEPA Delegation Manager at (916) 653-5157.

Attachments

Review Procedures for Environmental Impact Statements and Complex Environmental Assessments under the NEPA Delegation Pilot Program July, 2007

These procedures are to be followed for all Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) and Complex Environmental Assessments (EAs) [referred to here as Environmental Documents (ED)] both on and off the State Highway System for which Caltrans has been assigned responsibility under the Pilot Program. EISs and Complex EAs prepared for projects on local streets and roads shall be routed to the District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE) prior to the quality control review and the DLAE shall receive a copy of all review comments.

Step 1 District Quality Control Review

Process Summary

The District/Region will conduct a quality control review of each administrative ED in accordance with the requirements specified in the Quality Control Policy Memorandum, dated July 2, 2007.

The five reviews that constitute District/Region quality control are:

- Resource Specialist Review
- Peer Review
- Technical Editor Review
- NEPA Quality Control Review
- Environmental Branch Chief Review

The administrative ED will be revised as necessary, based on the District/Region Quality Control review. Comments received from all five levels of review will form the basis of revisions to the administrative ED. By signing the Quality Control Certification form, each reviewer will certify that the document is adequate within his or her area of expertise. The preparer of the environmental document will also complete the Environmental Document Review Checklist (Attachment 2).

Once the Senior Environmental Planner (SEP) supervising the environmental planner that prepared or oversaw preparation of the document determines that the administrative ED is complete and adequate, he/she will sign the Quality Control Review Certification sheet and the Environmental Document Review Checklist. The items on the checklist are to be cross- referenced with the corresponding page numbers found in the administrative ED. For EDs off the State Highway System, the Local Agency is responsible for providing cross-referenced page numbers on the checklist.

Review Period

As determined by District/Region.

Step 2 Division of Environmental Analysis and Legal Reviews

District Submittal Package

One week in advance of submitting the EIS or Complex EA for review, the District/Region will notify the appropriate Headquarters Division of Environmental Analysis (DEA) Environmental Coordinator (HQ EC) and Legal Office when the document is expected to arrive for review.

To initiate DEA review, the District/Region will submit the following:

- Transmittal Memo signed by the District/Region Senior Environmental Planner (SEP) requesting review
- 5 copies of the administrative ED
- 5 electronic copies of the administrative ED
- 1 copy of each technical study
- 1 electronic copy of each technical study
- 1 copy of the completed Environmental Document Review Checklist
- Completed and signed Quality Control Certification Sheet

To initiate Legal Division review, the District/Region will submit the following:

- Transmittal Memo signed by the District/Region SEP requesting legal review in the case of a draft EIS, or legal sufficiency review, in the case of a final EIS
- 1 copy of the administrative ED
- 1 electronic copy of the administrative ED
- 1 electronic copy of each technical study
- 1 copy of the completed Environmental Document Review Checklist
- Completed and signed Quality Control Certification Sheet

Process Summary

During Step 2, DEA will perform a quality assurance review of the ED. The Legal Office will conduct a legal review of the draft EIS, or a legal sufficiency review of the Final EIS.

The HQ EC will perform a preliminary review to determine if the administrative ED is substantively complete and ready for interdisciplinary quality assurance review. In making this determination, the HQ EC will confirm that the administrative ED follows the annotated outline and includes the following:

- Correct Title Page
- All chapters and necessary resource topics are present and complete
- All appendices are present and complete
- All required correspondence relative to procedural and regulatory requirements
- Complete, clear, legible and logical exhibits and figures

If the HQ EC finds that the administrative ED is not complete, DEA will not review the document, and the Legal Office will be instructed to suspend review until the HQ EC determines that the project documentation is complete.

The HQ EC will lead an interdisciplinary team of HQ resource specialists to review the document. Resource specialists will review pertinent portions of the document for accuracy and to ensure that regulatory requirements are appropriately addressed. The project technical studies will be used in support of the review. The HQ EC will review the entire ED and perform a NEPA Quality Assurance review.

Concurrently, and independent of DEA, the Legal Office will perform its required review.

Once the interdisciplinary team has completed its review, the HQ EC will consolidate the comments to assist the District/Region in making necessary revisions to the administrative ED.

The Legal Office will provide its legal review or legal sufficiency comments to the District/Region with a copy to DEA; comments from the Legal Office are independent from the DEA comments.

In the event that the HQ EC and the Legal Office have no comments on the administrative ED, the HQ EC will recommend to the District/Region that the ED is ready for signature. For a final EIS, where legal sufficiency is involved, the Legal Office will provide a legal sufficiency finding.

Review Period

30 Days.

Comments to District

DEA will transmit its comments on the ED to the District/Region and DLAE if applicable, with a copy to the responsible Legal Office. Legal will transmit its legal review comments or legal sufficiency review comments to the District/Region and DLAE if applicable, with a copy to the HQ EC.

Step 3 District/Region Final Revision and Review

Process Summary

During Step 3, the District/Region will revise the administrative ED in response to all comments that were received from DEA and, when applicable, the Legal Office. The District/Region is encouraged to communicate with the HQ EC if further clarification is needed regarding comments. The HQ EC will work with the District/Region to resolve issues identified in the comments and to ensure the document has been revised accordingly. A meeting or workshop may be convened by the HQ EC or the District/Region/DLAE to facilitate this process.

Once the ED has been revised in response to comments, the SEP will then review the revised ED and the revised Quality Review Certification Sheet to ensure that all comments have been appropriately addressed.

Review Period

As determined by District/Region.

Step 4 HQ Pre-Approval Review

The District/Region will submit the following materials to HQ DEA:

- Transmittal Memo signed by the District/Region Senior Environmental Planner (SEP) stating that the document has been revised pursuant to HQ EC comments and requesting preapproval review
- 1 copy of the revised ED
- 1 copy of revised ED with track changes
- 1 copy of comments with a response key
- 1 copy of the completed Environmental Document Review Checklist, as revised
- 1 copy of the signed Quality Review Certification Sheet, as revised

The Legal Office will receive the following:

- Transmittal Memo signed by the District/Region Senior Environmental Planner (SEP) stating
 that the document has been revised pursuant to the legal review or legal sufficiency review
 and requesting pre-approval review or legal sufficiency finding.
- 1 copy of the revised ED

- 1 copy of revised ED with track changes
- 1 copy of comments with a response key
- 1 copy of the completed Environmental Document Review Checklist, as revised
- 1 copy of the signed Quality Review Certification Sheet, as revised.

Process Summary

The HQ EC and the Legal Office will review the revised ED to ensure that all comments have been adequately addressed and that the ED is ready for signature. Both the HQ EC and the Legal Office must concur that its comments have been addressed. At this point, the HQ EC will take one of the following actions:

- (1) Find that minor changes are needed and coordinate directly with the document preparer to make the changes;
- (2) Determine that substantive issues remain and inform the District/Region in writing of the deficiencies and instruct them to resubmit the document upon subsequent revision;
- (3) Conclude that the ED is adequate and ready for circulation.

No approval action may be taken until both HQ EC quality assurance and legal review or legal sufficiency are satisfied.

Review Period

10 days.

Comments to District

No formal comment package is required at this step; however, in the event that substantive changes are required to the document, the HQ EC will prepare a memorandum for the District/Region detailing the deficiencies requiring correction.

Transmittal or Signature Authority

Upon completion of HQ DEA review and completing legal review or achieving legal sufficiency, the HQ EC will recommend in writing to the District/Region that the ED is ready for signature. The ED may not be signed until the ready-for-signature recommendation is received.

Step 5 District Approval

Process Summary

Following the recommendation of the HQ EC that the ED is ready for signature, the District/Region will sign the ED, consistent with the signature authorities below, and begin public circulation.

Review Period

Not applicable.

Submittal Package

The completed draft or final ED.

Signature Authority

Complex EA or Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Both the SEP and the HQ EC will recommend to the District Director (DD) that the title page or FONSI is ready for signature. The DD signs the document or may designate signature authority to the (1) the DDD for Environmental Planning or (2), the Environmental Office Chief (EOC) managing the environmental assessment unit that prepared the document.

EIS/Record of Decision (ROD)

The DDD and the EC jointly recommend to the DD that the EIS title page or the ROD is ready for signature. The DD signs the EIS or ROD. This signature may not be delegated.

Review Procedures for Environmental Impact Statements and Complex Environmental Assessments under the NEPA Delegation Pilot Program July, 2007

An EIS or complex EA, is prepared for a transportation project on or off the State Highway System. The document is ready for QC reviews.

Step 1: District Quality Control Review

Resource Specialist, Peer, Technical Editor, NEPA Quality Control, and Supervisor Reviews are conducted. Each Reviewer signs he QC Review Certification Sheet when their review is complete. District Env. Branch Chief sign the QC Review Certification Sheet and the Environmental Document Review Checklist.

Review period determined by District/Region

The District/Region notifies the Headquarers Environmental Coordinator (HQ EC) Legal Office 1 week in advance of submitting the review request.

Step 2: Division of Environmental Analysis and Legal Reviews

Submit to HQ DEA: Memo from the District/Region requesting review of the

administrative ED

5 copies of the administrative ED

5 Electronic copies of the administrative ED

1 copy of each technical study

1 copy of the completed ED Checklist

Completed and signed QC Certification Sheet

Submit to Legal: Memo from the District/Region requesting legal review in the case of

a draft ED, or legal sufficiency review, in the case of a final EIS

1 copy of the administrative ED

1 electronic copy of the administrative ED

1 electronic copy of each technical study

1 copy of the completed ED Checklist

Completed and signed QC Certification Sheet

HQ EC will review the entire ED and perform a NEPA Quality Assurance review. Concurrently, and independent of HQ-DEA, the Legal Division will perform its required review.

Review Period 30 Days

The DEA will transmit the comments to the DistrictRegion with a copy to the Legal Office. The Legal Office will transmit its comments on the legal review or leal sufficiency comments to the District/Region with a copy to HQ EC.

Step 3 District/Region Final Revision and Review

The District/Region will revise the administrative ED in response to all comments that were received from DEA and when applicable, the Legal Office. The SEP will review the revised administrative ED and the revised Quality Review Certification Sheet.

Review Period determined by District/Region

Continued on Page 2

Step 4: HQ Pre-Approval Review

The HQ EC and the Legal Officewill review the revised ED to ensure that all comments have been adequately addressed and that the ED is ready for signature.

The District/Region will submit the following materials to HQ-DEA:

Transmittal memo signed by the Distirct/RegionSEP stating that the document has been revised pursuantto HQ EC comments and requesting pre-approval review

- 1 copy of the revised ED
- 1 copy of revised ED with track changes
- 1 copy of comments with a response key
- 1 copy of the completed ED Review Checklist, as revised
- 1 copy of the signedQuality Review Certification Sheet, as revised

The Legal Division will receive the following:

Transmittal memo signed by the District. Region SEP stating that the document has been revised pursuant to the legal review or legal sufficiency review and requesting preapproval reviewor legal sufficiency finding.

- 1 copy of the revised ED
- 1 copy of revised ED with track changes
- 1 copy of comments with a response key
- 1 copy of the completed ED Review Checklist, as revised
- 1 copy of the signedQuality Review Certification Sheet, as revised.

10 day review period

Upon completion of the HQ-DEA review ad completing legal review or achieving legal sufficiency, the HQ EC will recommend in writing to the District/Region that the ED is ready for signature.

Step 5: District Approval

Follwoing the recommendation of the HQ EC that the ED is ready for signature, the District/Region will sign the ED and begin public circulation.

Submit: The Completed draft or final ED

Complex EA or Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Both the SEP and the HQ EC will recommend to the Batrict Director (DD) that the title page or FONSI is ready for signature. The DD signs the document or may designate authority to the (1) the DDD for Environmental Planning or (2), the Environmental Office Chief (EOC)managing the environmental assessment unit that prepared the document.

EIS/Record of Decision (ROD)

The DDD and the EC jointly recommend to the DDhat the EIS title page or the ROD is ready for signature. The DD signs the EIS or ROD. This signature may not be delegated.

Environmental Document Preparation and Review Tool

Page #	Check if content is:		Major Required Content Per Annotated Outline
in ED	Included	Not applicable	major required content i er Annotated Cutime
			Cover Sheet
			Follows annotated outline format
			General Information About This Document
			"What's in this document" section
			"What you should do" section
			"What happens next" section
			Title Sheet
			Follows annotated outline format
			Title including cooperating agencies
			Signature blocks
			Contacts
			Abstract
			Due date for comments
			Summary
			Overview of project area including major actions in same geographic area
			Purpose and need
			Proposed action including reasonable alternatives and preferred alternative, if identified
			Joint CEQA/NEPA document including boilerplate
			Project impacts (beneficial and adverse) including table
			Coordination with public/other agencies (approvals, unresolved issues, areas of controversy)
			Table of Contents
			Follows annotated outline format
			List of tables and figures
			Chapter 1—Purpose and Need for Project
			Brief introduction including appropriate figures
			Summary of how purpose and need developed through planning process and relevant studies
			Bulleted list of "purpose" statements
			Statements of "Need" using categories provided in annotated outline
			Project has independent utility and logical termini?
			Chapter 2—Project Alternatives
			Restatement of existing facility and project purpose and need
			Common design features of a reasonable range of build alternatives
			Unique features of a reasonable range of build alternatives
			TSM and TDM alternatives
			Estimated cost information
			No-action alternative
			Alternatives comparison matrix (not required)
			Preferred alternative, if one has been identified
			Locally preferred alternative, if one has been identified
			Alternatives considered but eliminated from further discussion
			Permits and approvals needed
			Chapter 3—Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures
			List of environmental topic areas determined to not be relevant
			Subheadings for all relevant topics:
			Regulatory Setting (use boilerplate language as appropriate)
			Affected Environment
			Impacts of each build alternative

Page #	Check if content is:		Major Required Content Per Annotated Outline
in ED	Included	Not applicable	major required content i of Annotated Cathine
			Permanent impacts
			Temporary (construction) impacts
			Direct impacts
			Indirect impacts
			Cumulative impacts
			Impacts of no-build alternative
			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
			Human Environment
			Land Use
			Regional summary
			Existing and future land uses, including map
			Development trends in project vicinity
			Description of relevant state, regional, and local plans and programs
			Transportation plans and programs
			Regional growth plans
			Habitat conservation plans
			General and community plans
			Specific development proposals
			Coastal zone management programs (use boilerplate language)
			Wild and scenic river designation (use boilerplate language)
			Consistency with relevant state, regional, and local plans and programs
			Indirect effects on land use patterns
			Identification of development prohibited from proceeding unless project is approved
			Description of and impacts/mitigation related to parks and recreational facilities
			Description of and impacts/mitigation related to Section 4(f) resources
			Growth Inducement Analysis
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			Beneficial and adverse effects of growth
			Farmlands/Timberlands
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			Coordination with NRCS
			Existing farmlands and farmland conversion including Form AD-1006
			Description of and impacts/mitigation related to Williamson Act contract lands
			Description of and impacts/mitigation related to timberlands
			Map of farmlands and timberlands
			Community Impacts
			Boilerplate regulatory settings
			Demographic data
			Existing types of housing and businesses
			Existing employment and tax base
			Location and sense of neighborhood and community cohesion for all alternatives
			Impacts to neighborhood and community cohesion
			Economic impact on regional and/or local economy
			Impact on economic vitality and established business districts including employment impact
			List of proposed partial and full residential and business acquisitions including table
			Description of residential and non-residential displacees for all alternatives
			Availability of replacement housing
			Environmental justice
			Utilities/Emergency Services (
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			Description of and impacts/mitigation related to water facilities

Page #	Check if content is:		Major Required Content Per Annotated Outline
in ED	Included	Not applicable	major required content i er Annotated Cutime
			Description of and impacts/mitigation related to sewage facilities
			Description of and impacts/mitigation related to electric power conveyance facilities
			Description of and impacts/mitigation related to telecommunication systems
			Description of and impacts/mitigation related to law, fire, and other emergency services
			Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			Existing and post-project (20-year time horizon beyond construction) traffic circulation
			Project measures to include circulation
			Description of and impacts/mitigation related to travel patterns for residences and businesses
			Project compliance with ADA
			Construction-related impacts
			Description of proposed Traffic Management Plan
			Description of and impacts/mitigation related to existing and planned bicycle facilities
			Visual/Aesthetics
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			Sensitive visual resources in project area
			Visual sensitivity of project area
			Before and after visual simulations
			Impacts to potential viewers of and from the project
			Proposed context-sensitive solutions
			Description of and impacts/mitigation related to scenic highways
			Cultural Resources
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			No disclosure of location of archeological sites
			Description of APE
			Discussion of significance of each evaluated cultural resource
			Impacts on resources listed or eligible for listing on NRHP
			Documentation of Section 4(f) use, if applicable
			De-minimis impact discussion, if applicable
			Documentation of consultation (include copies of correspondence)
			MOA process, if needed
			·
			Physical Environment
			Hydrology and Floodplain
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			Description of base 100-year floodplain
			Longitudinal/transverse encroachments of project alternatives
			Documentation of significant encroachment into the floodplain, if applicable
			Documentation of coordination with water resources and floodplain management agencies
	 		Only practicable alternative finding, if required
		<u> </u>	Summary Encroachment Report, if applicable
		<u> </u>	Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
	<u> </u>	ᆜ	Description of watersheds and receiving waters
	<u> </u>		Pertinent impact information from the Storm Water Quality Assessment
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Pertinent mitigation information from the Storm Water Quality Assessment
	│ 		Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			Site geology and subsurface conditions
			Impacts/mitigation related to erosion and geologic hazards
			Impacts/mitigation related to natural landmarks and landforms
			Paleontology

Page #	Check if content is:		Major Required Content Per Annotated Outline
in ED	Included	Not applicable	
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			Paleontological resources (no disclosure of exact location)
			Potential for unearthing or disturbing paleontological resources
			Hazardous Waste/Materials
			Summary of site assessments and investigations conducted
			Known and potential hazardous waste sites
			Coordination with regulatory agencies
			Justification for avoiding or not avoiding hazardous materials
			Estimate of costs for avoiding, reducing, or mitigating impacts
			Required provisions to handle hazardous materials during project implementation
			Air Quality
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			Existing climatic and meteorological conditions
			Applicable boilerplate conformity language
			Attainment status for each pollutant
			Hot-spot analysis for CO
			Qualitative analysis for particulate matter
			Hot-spot analysis for PM2.5 for projects of air quality concern
			Construction-related impacts
			Naturally occurring asbestos and structural asbestos Mobile source air toxics
			Noise
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			Sensitive land uses and receptors, including a map
			Existing and future noise levels, including tables
			Noise impact analysis ("substantial increase in noise levels"?)
			Description of noise abatement
			Noise abatement reasonable and feasible analysis
	Ш		Energy
	Ш	Ш	Quantitative analysis, if applicable
			Boilerplate language if quantitative analysis not needed
			Biological Environment
			Natural Communities
			Boilerplate introductory language
			Description of and impacts/mitigation related to habitat types (non-ESA/non-wetland)
			Wetlands and Other Waters
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			Wetland avoidance alternatives
			Waters/wetlands in the project area
			Quantification of impacts to waters/wetlands under each alternative, including table
			Impacts on function and value of waters/wetlands
			Map of waters/wetlands to be impacted under each alternative
			Measures to minimize harm to waters/wetlands
			Wetland Only Practicable Finding
			Documentation of agency coordination (include copies of correspondence)
			Plant Species
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			Description and impacts/mitigation related to special-status plant species (non-FESA/CESA)
			Description and impacts/mitigation related to species important to local and other agencies
			Animal Species
			Boilerplate regulatory setting

Page #	Check if content is:		Major Required Content Per Annotated Outline
in ED	Included	Not applicable	major required content of Annotated Culmic
			Description and impacts/mitigation related to special-status animal (including fish) species (non-ESA/CESA)
			Threatened and Endangered Species
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			Documentation of federal consultation to date (include copies of correspondence)
			Consistent with Environmental Handbook Volume 3 content requirements?
			Invasive Species
			Boilerplate regulatory setting
			Description of and impacts/mitigation related to invasive species in project area
			Relationship between Long-Term Uses of the Human Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity
			Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources that would be Involved in the Proposed Project
			Construction Impacts (Optional Placement)
			Cumulative Impacts (Optional Placement)
			Resource study area for each resource
			Current health and historical context of each resource
			Reference project-related direct and indirect impacts on each resource
			Current and reasonably foreseeable future actions and their impacts
			Mitigation for cumulative impacts
			Chapter 4—California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Evaluation
			Determining Significance under CEQA
			Boilerplate language
			Discussion of Significance of Impacts
			CEQA noise analysis
			Less than Significant Effects of the Proposed Project
			Significant Environmental Effects of the Proposed Project
			Unavoidable Significant Environmental Effects
			Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes
			Growth-Inducing Impacts (if not previously discussed)
			Mitigation Measures under CEQA
			Chapter 5—Comments and Coordination
			Boilerplate introduction
			Scoping process
			Consultation and coordination with public agencies
			Public participation
			Chapter 6—List of Preparers
			Chapter 7—Distribution List
			Appendix A: CEQA Checklist
			Appendix B: Section 4(f) Evaluation
			Introduction
			Description of proposed project and alternatives
			Description of 4(f) properties
			Impacts to 4(f) properties
			Avoidance alternatives
			Measures to minimize harm
			Documentation of coordination with agencies with jurisdiction of 4(f) resources
			Concluding statements
			Other park, recreational facilities, wildlife refuges, and historic properties
			Copies of correspondence
			Appendix C: Title VI Policy Statement

Page #	Check if content is:		Major Required Content Per Annotated Outline
in ED	Included	Not applicable	
			Appendix D: Summary of Relocation Benefits (if applicable)
			Appendix E: Glossary of Technical Terms (optional)
			Appendix F: Minimization and/or Mitigation Summary
			Appendix G: List of Acronyms (optional)
			List of Technical Studies
Check when completed:			
☐ Signed Environmental Document Quality Control Review Certification form			
☐ Memo submitting environmental document to DEA Environmental Coordinators			
☐ Environmental Commitments Record			